UNITY

FREEDOM. FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Stars of the Summer Night

By ALSON H. ROBINSON

Is There Remedy for China's Troubles?

By GILBERT REID

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

Chapter XVII. By M. K. GANDHI

President Coolidge and Jefferson

By EDWIN D. MEAD

VOLUME XCIX NUMBER 23

Chicago, August 2, 1926

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Sidney Coltver, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. G. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.

Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Francis L. Rossiter, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
George Saranton
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—F. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Gilbert Reid
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lusidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoha
RUSSIA—Afina Huebach

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY

A Journal of Religion in Democracy

UNITY was the first American paper to discover Gandhi, of India. When the great Mahatma was unknown even to newspapers, UNITY hailed him as "the greatest man in the world." Its files contain the most complete record of Gandhi and his work that exists in this country, and are continuing this record of original documents, special articles, editorial comments regularly. It is now publishing his Autobiography in weekly installments.

UNITY was the first American paper to espouse and advocate the Outlawry of War, that remarkable peace program that is sweeping the world. Its files are and will continue to be the most complete record in America of the progress of this cause.

UNITY has for more than forty years championed the idea of universal religion which finds in freedom the secret of unity and brotherhood, and it is today the outstanding organ of this opinion in this country.

UNITY is a weekly paper, sixteen pages, containing timely editorial comment, special articles, foreign correspondence by its own representatives in Europe and Asia, book reviews, and regular reports of news from the field of liberal thought and action.

CAN YOU GET ALONG WITHOUT IT?

WE THINK NOT!

Send for sample copies.

700 Oakwood Boulevard - - CHICAGO

$3.00 per year

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 355
Stars of the Summer Night—ALSON H. ROBINSON 357
Editorial Correspondence:
Is There Remedy for China's Troubles?—GILBERT REID 358
American Notes—SYDNEY STRONG 359

ARTICLES—

Gandhi?—*Walter Savage Landor* 355
The Story of My Experiments with Truth—Chapter XVII—Experiments in Dietetics—M. K. GANDHI 361
Gandhi the Christian!—Bombay *Chronicle* 362
President Coolidge and Jefferson—EDWIN D. MEAD 363

POETRY—

Quest—LUCIA TRENT 362
Eternal Recurrence—E. MERRILL ROOT 362

THE STUDY TABLE—

The Next War—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 365
"Black Laughter"—MARY WHITE OVINGTON ... 365
Note 365

CORRESPONDENCE—

The Way to Outlawry—HENRY W. PINKHAM .. 366
Peacemakers and Hoodlums at Concord—EDWIN D. MEAD 366

THE FIELD—

Oriental Students' Conference 367

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCIX MONDAY, AUGUST 2, 1926 NUMBER 23

GANDHI?

"Cunning is not wisdom; prevarication is not policy; and (novel as the notion is, it is equally true) armies are not strength. Acre and Waterloo show it, and the flames of the Kremlin and the solitudes of Fontainbleau. One honest man, one wise man, one peaceful man, commands a hundred millions, without a baton and without a charger. He wants no fortress to protect him; he stands higher than any citadel can raise him, brightly conspicuous to the most distant nations, God's servant by election, God's image by beneficence."

—Walter Savage Landor (1847).

In the Milwaukee *Leader* for July 8th appears the following editorial, significantly entitled, "Thou, Too, UNITY":

UNITY tells in an interesting editorial why it is well that the sesquicentennial celebration of the signing of the Declaration of Independence comes at this time. The celebration compels attention to democracy in a period when dictatorships are the order of the day in some parts of Europe and when a good many Americans are worshippers at the feet of dictatorship.

In this connection we find UNITY saying: "Our conservatives bow down and worship Mussolini. Our Socialists abandon Socialism and take over not what is best but what is worst in the Communist idea."

If John Haynes Holmes wrote the editorial, we wonder how he gets that way.

He is right about the conservatives, but he is teetotally wrong about the Socialists. We Socialists are not abandoning Socialism and we are not taking over any part of the Communist idea. We stand for both political and industrial democracy.

Furthermore, we vigorously oppose dictatorship—in Russia, in Italy and everywhere else. We oppose violent revolution. We oppose militarism. We work for the abolition of the causes of war. We seek to change capitalism gradually, peacefully and constructively into Socialism. We admit that we have our faults, but we decidedly plead not guilty to those faults which UNITY tries to hang upon us.

There are many publications which misrepresent us, but we did not expect it of UNITY. Its readers are persons whose good opinion is worth having, and we think it ought to correct its palpable misrepresentation.

We print this editorial in full in order that we may make adequate amends for the injustice done to our Socialist friends. For we recognize that the complaint of the *Leader* is as just in content as it is gentle and considerate in expression. What we had in mind, of course, in the statement quoted, was that large section of the Socialist Party—the Left—which lost its head over the Russian revolution, and, in slavish imitation of the worst as well as the best ideas and methods of the Bolsheviki, organized the various Communist groups which rival one another in taking orders from Moscow. This, we repeat, is what we had in mind—but we didn't say so! On the contrary, with inexcusable carelessness, we put all the Socialists in this country under the serious reproach of abandoning Socialism in favor of doctrinaire Communism; whereas the great majority of the Party, the true Socialists, as the *Leader* correctly points out, "are not taking over any part of the Communist idea." With stern fidelity and at heavy cost, they have stood fast against this betrayal of the democratic ideal which underlies all genuine Socialism, and are thus entitled to protection against such misrepresentation as this of which we were guilty. We are glad to endorse all that the *Leader* says about the Socialists in their opposition to militarism and capitalism, and hail them anew as our admired comrades in the great battle for the liberation of mankind.

Now that the smoke and flame have cleared away from the lakes and mountains of New Jersey—the explosions ended, the bodies of the dead collected and buried, the refugees returned to their shattered homes, and the work of reconstruction begun—it may be well to pause for a moment and consider what actually happened. On the shores of Lake Denmark, in the midst of a beautiful farming country, is a naval arsenal. Here are—or rather were—a dozen or more magazines, stored with vast quantities of dynamite, smokeless powder, TNT, 12- and 16-inch shells, small arms ammunition, etc. On the afternoon of Saturday, July 10th last, in the midst of a terrific thunder storm, one of these magazines was struck by lightning, and then the havoc of destruction and death began. A whole countryside was swept with ruin—men, women and children were killed, maimed, blinded, stunned—hundreds of homes were wrecked beyond repair—whole towns were devastated with debris. It was as though war had suddenly descended upon the country—this section of New Jersey, said the newspapers, looked like the western front! Now what were all these explosives doing in New Jersey? They were stored there in preparedness for war. For what purpose? Why, for use against the enemy. What enemy? We don't know—yet. But somewhere, in quiet valleys, by pleasant lakesides, on farms and in villages, are happy men and women and little children who tomorrow may be our enemies—and this TNT and these 16-inch shells were laid up for their destruction. But they got away from us, thanks to a lightning bolt, and were used for *our* destruction! In other words, all the horror and havoc which fell upon those innocent people

of New Jersey, we were planning to visit deliberately upon other innocent people in some enemy country, when a declaration of war, like a lightning stroke, was hurled upon them. All this death and destruction which came upon us by accident, we were preparing for others with malice aforethought. Our sword—a two-edged sword always—was unexpectedly turned against ourselves; and, to change the figure, we got a dose of our own medicine! Go to New Jersey, you who believe in or apologize for war, and ask yourselves why this, which happened to our own people, is so horrible, and the same thing, when visited upon other people, is so glorious!

For sheer, unadulterated impudence we have seen nothing to compare with the comments which Senator Edwards, of New Jersey, saw fit to offer the nation on the Lake Denmark explosion disaster. Somebody is to blame for this catastrophe, of course, so the Senator, a Democrat and a militarist, hastens to fix the responsibility upon the pacifists and President Coolidge! If anything could make us a friend and advocate of the man in the White House it would be this ridiculous charge that Calvin Coolidge's "foolish economy policy" has been "carried to such extremes as to endanger the lives of a score or more communities." This is unjust! There is about as much connection between the explosion of the naval depot at Lake Denmark and the President's fiscal policy, as there is between that policy and the recent earthquake in Sumatra. Senator Edwards is playing politics; he is using a great calamity as an excuse for attacking a political opponent, and the shame of it should drive him from public life. The same thing is true, to an even greater extent, of Senator Edwards' attack upon the pacifists: "The tragic tale of Lake Denmark's arsenal disaster will probably not be unfolded for weeks, but the lesson to be learned is known now. Let the pacifists stop howling down Federal appropriations sufficiently large . . . to make less inviting an army and navy catastrophe such as has plunged into sorrow and ruin large populations of New Jersey." This is so ridiculous that it stirs hilarity rather than indignation. If there had been larger appropriations, there would have been more ammunition in storage and a more terrible disaster, that is all. It is thanks to the pacifists that the explosion was not infinitely worse. Personally, we think it foolish and wrong to try to assess direct responsibility for a disaster of this kind. Everybody was doing his best, including the naval officers in charge of the arsenal. Nobody can stop or deflect a bolt of lightning! But if any persons *are* to be blamed, let it be the militarists who insist upon piling up immense stores of ammunition in preparation for battle against some enemy, the senators and representatives who give money to these militarists to carry out their insane pranks, and the citizens generally who allow themselves to be obsessed with the mania of war.

James Truslow Adams, in his new history, "New England in the Republic," has some pertinent observations on the persistent propensity of Massachusetts to practice violence:

> It is interesting, he says (page 122), to trace this spirit of intolerance and forcible coercion that appears again and again throughout the entire history of Massachusetts. Whether the questions in dispute were religious, political or economic . . . the people of that state have always shown a much greater tendency than any other part of New England to descend to the arguments of threatenings, intimidation, physical violence, bloodshed, and mob action. It is a psychological trait that must be admitted, though it cannot be explained.

Again, Dr. Adams refers (page 142) to "the constant tendency of minority (as well as majority) opinion to find expression in violent mob-action." Referring specifically to indignation in Boston against Jay's treaty with England, he points out (page 216) that "the opinion of certain sections there took *the usual expression of mob violence.*" The practice continued straight through anti-slavery days, as witness the Garrison mobs; and now it appears in our own time, as witness most recently the disgraceful assaults on the Armistice Day parade in Boston last November, and the incredible rioting in Concord against the pacifists only last month. The shame of this last episode is peculiarly black. The gathering was respectable in the extreme, no dangerous "reds" were present, the speakers were men of eminence and conspicuous public service, the addresses, says the *Christian Register,* were "all peaceable, spiritual, elevated and noble." Yet these people were beset by hoodlums, bespattered with rotten eggs, assailed with stink-bombs, and at last driven from the town. And no arrest was made, not even a remonstrance spoken. All this in the home of Ralph Waldo Emerson! But, as our colleague, Professor Clarence R. Skinner, of Tufts College, has well said—"the tradition that survives in Concord is not the tradition of Emerson, but the tradition of Concord bridge"—Massachusetts, as James Truslow Adams would point out, is still true to her anarchist tradition.

The recent "open letter," issued by a group of bishops and laymen of the Episcopal Church as the keynote of a "bishops' crusade" to be launched in the spring, was an amazing document. Amazing, first of all, for the frankness with which it confessed the ineffectiveness, the sheer futility, of the church today! The Protestant Episcopal Church, it declared, is "as idle as a painted ship"; then, adding specifications to this indictment, it went on:

> The church today, is incomparably rich in money, organization, influence, power, and yet it is failing to produce anything like apostolic results. For example, our communion with its 135 bishops, over 5,000 priests and more than 1,000,000 communicants, secured a net gain last year of only 25,000 members, which means that with all our resources it took 50 persons to add one communicant.

But this document is amazing not so much for its

confession of the plight of the church as for its pronouncement of the *purpose* of the church. What must we do, cry the bishops and their lay associates; what are we here for? And they answer by declaring that the church must gain 100,000 new members next year, and by setting on foot elaborate plans for a nation-wide campaign to this end. So *this* is the purpose of the church—to gain new members unto itself! It is organized expressly and primarily for the business of building up a big constituency! Its job is to make Episcopalians! If it makes them at the rate of only 25,000 a year, then it is failing; but, if, by strenuous efforts centering in an expensive "drive," it can make as many as 100,000 a year, then it is succeeding! Was there ever such a revelation of just what denominationalism means in this Protestant world of ours? Could anything be more thread-bare, ragged-and-tattered, utterly naked, spiritually speaking, than this declaration by conspicuous churchmen of what a church is here for? No mention of the world and its awful need this day! No cry for the purification of politics, the redemption of labor, the ending of poverty, crime, and the gross indecencies of a pleasure-mad generation! No dedication to the battle against militarism, imperialism, and war! No prayer for peace among the nations and races of men! Only *more church members,* friends! A hundred thousand Episcopalians, please!! Is it for this that Jesus lived? Is it for this that he perished on the cross? For shame, ye blind leaders of the blind! Go bury yourselves, for ye were dead long since, and ye now pollute the air!

Stars of the Summer Night

If Mr. Ring Lardner and his associates in the field of barber shop ballad artistry should chance to stumble upon this phrase, their subsequent reaction is inevitable. Now all together: "Far in yon azure deep, hide, hide your golden light." And the murderous swipes are committing their worst. It's very delicate verse which bids the stars to hide their golden light while "My lady sleeps," as Longfellow does in "The Spanish Student." But this particular summer has thus far been notable for rather too great modesty on the part of the stars.

Among the pure delights of human emotion few are keener than to lie on some broad hillside on a warm summer's evening under the wide and open sky, looking out through the unimaginable spaces between the stars. Then as Emerson says: "All mean egotism vanishes. I become a transparent eyeball; I am nothing; I see all; the currents of the Universal being circulate through me; I am part or particle of God."

Therefore if we do not feel capable of vocalizing over these summer stars we may quietly and in solitude indulge in a bit of speculation.

In the first place let us speculate upon the possibility of life on some other planet than our own. At the present stage of our knowledge the only answer that we can make to such a question is that we don't know; but certainly the existence of such conditions of life on other planets is by no means an impossibility. So far as our own planetary system is concerned, Uranus and Neptune are probably too hot to permit of any form of life. Mercury turns on its axis at the same rate of speed that it turns around the sun. This means that the heat of the sunlit side of mercury is above the boiling point, while the cold on the other side must be between two and three hundred degrees below the freezing point. So there remains the possibility of Mars and Venus. Venus seems like a promising planet to live on from certain points of view. There is an excellent atmosphere which one might breathe, uncontaminated let us hope by the sort of pollution which surrounds some of our great cities. It is similar in size to the earth, and as distances go its relation to the sun is not far separated from ours. Unfortunately there seems to be considerable evidence that like Mercury, Venus always presents the same face to the sun, which throws it out for the purpose of maintaining life under any such conditions as we are familiar with.

So Mars remains. Prof. Percival Lowell, certainly the greatest authority of his time concerning the planet Mars, felt that the evidence that there is, or was life on this interesting planet were very strong. The great lines which may be seen running north and south upon its surface, he believed to be great beds of vegetation marking the sites of enormous canals by which the Martians draw their water from the polar regions. Prof. Pickering, also a distinguished authority, is not quite satisfied with this explanation and has another theory of his own. However these scholars may appear to conflict in the various theories advanced they all seem to agree in the complete possibility of life upon the planet Mars and to suggest that in spite of the difficulties involved our elder brothers may yet flash across space the solution of many of our problems.

But of course it would be altogether inadequate to restrict our search for life on other planets to those within the paltry limits of our own solar system. It seems probable that in the galaxy of the suns with which our heavens are lighted at night and which we call stars there are several thousand millions of planets. Naturally some of these would be very much younger that our earth, since it appears that new planets are constantly being born, and so they would be at the

stage at which the first steps in the evolution of life are being taken. Prof. Moulton of the University of Chicago in summing up this entire situation regarding the existence of life on other planets, says "there is no reason to doubt that life would organize itself on other planets where conditions suitable for life existed." Here then is speculation number one as on a warm summer's evening you lie out upon a hillside and look out through the infinite spaces. It is the possibility of life upon other planets.

Or perhaps you would like to consider this universe which occupies the heavens from the point of view of its magnitude. Of course the stars have never been counted, and probably never will be. But we know that each of these twinkling messengers which casts its beams upon our earth with such gentleness is in reality a flaming ball of fire quite like our sun, and that conservatively speaking there are a thousand million of them in the space surrounding our solar system. And when one realizes that these millions of suns are moving around through space more or less irregularly like a swarm of bees, rather than revolving about some great center, such as our own little sun, as used to be believed by the writers of the Bible, then we are made to realize the monumental egotism which has made man place himself in the center of the Universe.

For another thing, we even know something about the shape of this galaxy of the universe. Astronomers tell us that it is approximately watch shaped. Distances are inconceivable, and since the measurement in terms of linear miles means little or nothing to astronomical science, they have to speak to us in other terms for purposes of calculation. They tell us for instance, that the distance through the short way of this watch, that is from the face to the back of the watch, is 30 thousand light years—a light year being that distance that light travels in the course of a year at the rate of 186 thousand miles per second. And they tell us that the distance through this watch—the long way—is something like 200 thousand light years. If anybody wants to struggle with such computation he is perfectly at liberty to do so. In any case here are certain matters of magnitude which may provide ample food for speculation.

There is another matter of established scientific fact upon which we may possibly reflect with profit. Certainly I should like to suggest it for the edification of some of our fundamentalist friends whose periodic prophecy of the end of the world arouses such frequent waves of mingled amusement and distress. I refer to the duration of life of these heavenly bodies. Every now and then one of these prophets of gloom comes along with entire confidence in his possession of supernatural knowledge. I believe that one of the most recent and most blatant of them has announced that God has revealed to him that the end of the world is to come on the 14th day of August. Well, of course God hasn't revealed anything of the sort to him, and it isn't going to happen. All such a person needs is kindly treatment in a home for the feeble minded.

We now know exactly how it is that planets such as our earth are destroyed and by the same token how it is that they come into existence. And we know further more about how often it is that such matters take place. Planets are born not as human beings are usually, but they are born in families a lot of them at the same time, and it happens when one of these thousand million other suns than our own comes within some appreciable contact with some other sun. We do not know how long in the past it was when this earth of ours and the other planets in our solar system were born, but the evidence seems clear from the portions of radio active material found in some of the oldest of our rocks that the earth has been full grown for at least two billion years. How much longer the earth will continue in its present condition of course is speculation to a large degree. We know on the average that old planets are destroyed and new ones brought into existence about once in a million billion years, and since we have lived about two billion out of that million billion which is the average life of a planet, just as 53 years is the average life of a man, if anybody is uneasy regarding the future he may make such provision as he wishes.

Having sung ourselves hoarse with the song, or grown weary with speculation as the case may be, the stars may now hide their golden light and permit my lady to sleep.

ALSON H. ROBINSON.

Is There Remedy for China's Troubles?

[Editorial Correspondence]

It is reported that the two distinguished military leaders, Chang Tso-lin and Wu Pei-fu, have reached agreement on the military question but not on governmental issues such as constitution, parliament, cabinet, election of a new President, finances and unification. The latter issues are regarded by many Chinese as the more important and delay is necessary in order to attain careful deliberation. As an outside observer, anxious to see the rehabilitation of China and security for the Chinese people, I am inclined to differ from this expressed view-point of Chinese publicists. It may be a delusion on my part, but I have the definite conviction that the military question is the most important of all questions. Settled rightly, other questions will be easy of solution. Settled wrongly, China's troubles will gather and rush forward like a mighty tornado, allow-

ing no time for the discussion of political aspects of a nation's existence. When two thoughtful and experienced men like these two renowned Marshals make up their minds to further fighting, fighting, moreover, against fellow countrymen and fellow provincials, there must be some real reason for such a momentous decision. It is for us less intelligent mortals to ponder the reason thus far made known.

The reason as announced is to attack and wipe out the Bolshevik contamination of the Northwest Army. In the first place, how far is this army, which is certainly a well-disciplined army, and how far are its generals, who are for the most part Christian men and observe the moral mandates for personal behaviour, really contaminated by the Bolshevik, Communistic, or even Soviet ideas of revolutionary Russia? Are they so completely degenerated as to require complete extermination?

In the second place, while all countries may think it necessary to guard against the subtlety of Bolshevik propaganda, the peril of Communistic ideas, the unsuitability of the Soviet system, yet it may well be doubted whether the Chinese in making use of internecine strife are adopting the wisest method for self-preservation. The evils to be averted are economic and political in character. The true remedy is to be found in a sounder education, in moral persuasion, in public and restrained discussion and in collaboration with the experts of other countries in the study of problems that are world-wide in scope. Herein is the reign of reason and law and the pursuit of the method of consultation, arbitration and judicial procedure. The result will be true democracy, and not dictatorship of an individual, of a commission, of the proletariat, of militarists, or of any other kind yet known to nations.

Dependence on warfare and shedding of blood for averting danger from within or without and for curing evils that are economic and political in character is more and more regarded as a fallacious conception of an over-excited brain. Statesmen everywhere are straining every energy to devise a method of national existence that is for self and for others less destructive and more composed, poised and enduring. Certainly it needs but little argument to point the moral that the people of any nation who indulge in killing each other through a period of years, one set of men seeking to destroy another set of men, and all of the same blood, are committing *national suicide*.

Here is the strange spectacle, saying nothing of Szechuan, Hunan, and Kuangtung, of a vast army being gathered together in North China from Shantung, Chihli, Homen, Shanse, Shensi, Fengtien, Kirin and Heilungkiang to attack other Shantung, Honan and Chihli men in Charhar, Suiyuan, Kansuh and Mongolia, and all to root out some supposed political theory. This at least is the ostensible reason for this gigantic war of Chinese with Chinese.

At the very time that Chinese statesmen are called to the task of forming a stable government and settling the many financial and diplomatic questions of a great continental people, at the very time when the government of the national capital has no money to meet administration, educational and municipal needs, at this time vast armies are crowding in on the capital, crying out for millions of dollars to maintain this fighting proclivity of the New China. How calamitous to the life of the nation! How pitiable the lot of the people! Here is the slicing up of China, not by foreign governments but by warring Chinese.

Whether one side or another is victorious, and whether victorious in whole or in part, does not much matter, for the Chinese are inflicting injury on one another, and the whole of China and all forms of government are made weaker and weaker and both foreign and domestic obligations are left unmet.

The more the northwest army is pressed, the more will it be pushed, along with all Mongolia, into the arms of Soviet Russia; one evil will follow another, and more fighting will be required. The coalition of military forces may be victorious, but there *can never be fighting to a finish,* there can never be a settlement through war; in mutual destructiveness there can never be unification of the nation or rehabilitation of the nation's form of government or of its finances.

GILBERT REID.

Peking.

American Notes

[Editorial Correspondence]

I

This is the season of the year when some tens of thousands of college graduates are let loose upon the world. The season also, when many editors challenge the value of a college education. It is pointed out that Lincoln never had a college education; in fact, he probably would never have been heard of had he gone to college. This is the way Charles E. Rugh puts it, "If Lincoln had had knowledge heaped upon him in the manner it is heaped upon modern youths, his brain would have become so befuddled as to be useless to him." Lincoln was compelled to think. He digested what he studied. His difficulties in gaining knowledge only increased the powers of his mind. It is pointed out that the mental flabbiness of our day, the willingness of the people to be gulled, censored, herded, regulated, is partly due to the lack of the early habit of hard thinking. There is little encouragement to use self-help. It is this kind of gauntlet that college education is compelled to run these days.

What are the facts? These: The greatest men in American public life have not been college-trained. Lincoln is not the only one. There is Ford, who went "to the district school"—in his boyhood pronounced "deestric." There is the elder Rockefeller, the founder of Standard Oil. He had "some instruction from his mother." And, of course, Edison is a big American. He, too, was home-made and self-made. And Carnegie, the first steel king, did not see college walls, although he has helped to build many. He started in to work for a dollar a day, and as a boy of twelve acted as a messenger-boy. The three richest American corporations, judged by earnings, are U. S. Steel, Standard Oil and Ford Motor, their comparative earnings $818,285,481, $599,188,951, $526,441,951 respectively. The founders of these corporation were not college bred. So far, the anti-college debaters have the best of the argument. Here are some interesting statistics which show another side. Less that 1 per cent of American men are college graduates, yet this number

has furnished 55 per cent of the American Presidents, 26 per cent of the members of Congress, 54 per cent of the Vice-Presidents, 62 per cent of the Secretaries of State, 69 per cent of the Supreme Court judges. In the political realm, described as that realm where "talkers" excel, a college education seems to give a citizen the advantage. It will be safe to conclude that the greatest Americans have not been college-bred. Those who come next to these—who may be described as being first-class second-rate men—are largely drawn from college ranks. Genius, in America as in other lands, has a good chance of being spoiled by the college. Whereas, the great mass of mediocre men are vastly improved by college training. The greatest preachers are not, as a rule, products of institutions, while the great mass of preachers next to these are from the colleges. In general, let me say about American life, this land has been and still is a land where genius has a wide opportunity and large encouragement for development.

II

This leads me to refer to an interesting contest just closed in the enterprising city of Seattle. A loving cup was to be given to "The Most Useful Citizen," i. e., the citizen who had rendered during the past year the most useful service to the city. A tribunal of 12 citizens was selected. These twelve were representatives of various clubs of the city, such as Rotary, Lions, Mutual Business, Kiwanis and others. Two were women. Letters were to be mailed to this tribunal. Naturally, there would be something of a bias in such a tribunal. An extremist, like Jesus, would be passed over. Any one with rather marked features would scarcely satisfy the public. He would need to be a kind of "an all-round good fellow," something like the "normal baby." The man who was selected and announced this morning is Nathan Eckstein. The kind of man selected is the most important from my desire to give a picture of American life. He is a Jew and was born in Germany. There is a small percentage of Jews in this city; and only last month the local school board had the courage and sanity to restore to the curriculum—after eight years of discontinuance—the study of German. The choice of the tribunal will give satisfaction. Mr. Eckstein during the past year has served as chairman of the Community Fund, as chairman of the Chamber of Commerce Transportation Board, active in the International Trade Convention, and lastly is now acting as representative of the U. S. Secretary of War in the civilian camps. The contest was characteristicly American in that it was what the Russians would name as being "bourgeois." The "jury" was largely of business people. I cannot conceive of a similar tribunal in England, Australia, or South Africa being formed, with Labor left out. In democratic America, Labor never seems to be considered as a part of society to be represented, unless it may be in case of war or a strike. However, that a tribunal should select as the "Most Useful Citizen" a Jew, and one born in Germany, is significant and encouraging.

III

Sidney L. Gulick is one of our most socially-minded Americans. Further, he is most inventive and indefatigable in pushing methods for the cultivation of good will. He comes by it naturally, for he was born in Japan, of missionary parentage. For twenty years he was engaged in educational work, in the sunrise kingdom. The last twenty years he has spent in the United States, except when he has been in foreign lands, on the "king's business." He is a real peace-maker and weaver of strands that bind nations together. Naturally, the relations between Japan and America interest him the most, although he is secretary of a department of "International Justice and Good Will" in the Federal Council of Churches in America, which department is cognizant of all nations. When the War broke out, he was in Constance, with others, just ready to call to order a world's peace conference, that had been summoned from the uttermost parts of the earth.

The Gulick family is noted for social service, unlimited by national boundaries. His brother was Luther Gulick, founder of the "Camp Fire Girls" and inventor of the game of basket-ball, also teacher and lecturer. The books of his sister, Mrs. Jewett, are widely used in the schools, and are noted for their spirit of good will. And so on. Sidney L. Gulick is the man who proposed the percentage scheme for the solution of the problem of immigration. He came at it from the side of the Japanese. He proposed that immigrants should be received on a percentage basis, 5 per cent, I believe it was. In order not to discriminate and thus offend any nation, his plan was to let all people in on this percentage—the percentage being worked on the number of citizens of that particular nationality already in the country. In Japan's case, only a few hundred would thus have been admitted—certainly no danger of an innundation—but the plan would have been just to all alike. After several years of education, in which Dr. Gulick took the leading part, Congress passed a percentage immigration law, but, alas, left out the part that was especially dear to his heart, viz., making the law apply equally to all nations. Congress made it apply to all nations—except those which were ineligible to citizenship. This excluded practically all Orientals. He won many enemies for his "pro-Japanese" activities. Californians, especially, roundly abused him, and in a most unjust way, for he is really a great soul, exceedingly able, and without guile. But so is still the way of the jungle.

Dr. Gulick's latest suggestion for promoting understanding and good-will between America and Japan is being worked through a committee on World Friendship Among Children (289 4th Ave., N. Y. City). He proposes that a million or more American children send as many dolls to as many Japanese children, these to reach them on the 3rd day of March, which marks a Japanese family custom, called the Festival of Dolls and which they make much of. In Japanese families, dolls of mothers and grandmothers are kept and brought out on that occasion. Choice dolls may be kept in the family for many generations. In no better way, Dr. Gulick thinks, could American childhood touch Japanese childhood so effectively as through the Doll Festival. With each American Doll would go an appropriate message of good-will. Each doll is to cost about three dollars. They are to be nice, worth keeping. Money is to be sent in to the Doll Travel Bureau, 289 4th Ave., N. Y. City, which will be transformed into dolls of the correct dimensions and style. The dolls "will be from 13 to 16 inches tall, and should look like attractive American boys and girls." The dolls will be distributed by the Education Department of Japan. . . . I am inclined to think that doll-diplomacy will be more effective than dollar-diplomacy. Anyway, it is worth trying. . . . Success to the Doll Travel Bureau!

SYDNEY STRONG.

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

[The Autobiography of Mahatma Gandhi]

(Copyrighted, 1926)

CHAPTER XVII

Experiments in Dietetics

As I searched myself deeper the necessity for changes both internal and external began to grow on me. As soon as, or even before, I made alterations in my way of living and expenses, I began to make changes in my diet. I saw that the writer on vegetarianism had examined the question very minutely, attacking it in its religious, scientific, practical and medical aspects. Ethically they had arrived at the conclusion that man's supremacy over the lower animals meant not that the former should prey upon the latter, but that the higher should protect the lower, or that there should be mutual aid between the two as between man and man. They had also brought out the truth that man eats not for enjoyment but to live. And some of them accordingly suggested and effected in their lives abstention not only from flesh-meat but from eggs and milk. Scientifically some had concluded that man's physical structure showed that he was not meant to be a cooking but a frugivorous animal; that he could take only his mother's milk, and as soon as he had teeth should begin to take solid foods. Medically they had suggested the rejection of all spices and condiments. And from the practical and economic argument they had demonstrated that a vegetarian diet was the least expensive. All these considerations had their effect on me, and I came across vegetarians of all these types in vegetarian restaurants. There was a Vegetarian Society in England with a weeekly journal of its own. I subscribed to the weekly and joined the society and very shortly found myself on the Executive Committee. Here I came in contact with those who were regarded as pillars of vegetarianism, and began my own experiments in dietetics.

I stopped taking the sweets and condiments I had got from home; and the mind having taken a different turn, the fondness for condiments wore away, and I now relished the boiled spinach which in Richmond tasted insipid, cooked without condiments. Many such experiments taught me that the real seat of taste was not the tongue but the mind.

The economic consideration was of course constantly before me. There was in those days a body of opinion which regarded tea and coffee as harmful and favored cocoa. And as I was convinced that one should eat only articles that sustained the body, I gave up tea and coffee as a rule, and substituted cocoa.

There were two divisions in the restaurants I used to visit. One division which was patronized by fairly well-to-do people provided any number of courses from which one chose and paid for *a la carte* (each dinner thus costing from one to two shillings). The other division provided six-penny dinners of three courses with a slice of bread. In my days of strict frugality, I usually dined in the second division.

There were many minor experiments going on along with the main one, e. g., giving up starchy foods at one time, living on bread and fruit alone at another, and some time living on cheese, milk and eggs. This last experiment is worth noting. It lasted not even a fortnight. The reformer who advocated starchless food had spoken highly of eggs and held that eggs were not meat. It was apparent that there was no injury done to living creatures in taking eggs. I was taken in by this plea and took eggs in spite of my vow. But the lapse was momentary. I had no business to put a new interpretation on the vow. The interpretation of my mother who administered the vow was there for me. I know that her definition of meat included eggs. And as soon as I saw the true import of the vow I gave up eggs and the experiment alike.

There is a nice point underlying the argument and worth noting. I came across three definitions of meat in England. According to the first, meat denoted only the flesh of birds and beasts. Vegetarians who accepted that definition abjured the flesh of birds and beasts, but ate fish, not to mention eggs. According to the second definition, meat meant flesh of all living creatures. So fish was here out of the question, but eggs were allowed. The third definition included under meat the flesh of all living beings, as well as all their products, thus covering eggs and milk alike. If I accepted the first definition, I could take not only eggs, but fish also. But I was convinced that my mother's definition was the definition binding on me. If, therefore, I would observe the vow I had taken, I must abjure eggs. I therefore did so. This was a hardship inasmuch as inquiry showed that even in vegetarian restaurants many courses used to contain eggs; which meant that unless I knew what was what, I had to go through the awkward process of ascertaining whether a particular course contained eggs or no; for many puddings and cakes were not free from them. But though the revelation of my duty caused this difficulty, it simplified my food. The simplification in its turn brought me annoyance in that I had to give up several dishes I had come to relish. These difficulties were only passing, for the strict observance of the vow produced an inward relish distinctly more healthy, delicate and permanent.

The real ordeal, however, was still to come, and that was in respect of the other vow. But who dare harm what God protects?

A few observations about the interpretation of vows or pledges may not be out of place here. Interpretation of pledges has been a fruitful source of strife all the world over. No matter how explicit the pledge, people will turn and twist the text to their own purposes. They are to be met with among all classes of society, from the rich down to the poor, from the prince down to the peasant. Selfishness turns them blind and by a use of the ambiguous middle they deceive themselves and seek to deceive the world and God. One golden rule is to accept the interpretation honestly put on the pledge by the party administering it. Another is to accept the interpretation of the weaker party, where there are two interpretations possible. Rejection of these two rules gives rise to strife and iniquity. It is founded on untruthfulness. He who has selected the right path easily follows the golden rule. He need not seek learned advice for interpretation. My mother's interpretation of meat was, according to the golden

rule, the only true one for me, and not the one my wider experience or my pride of better knowledge might have taught me.

To return.

My experiments in England were conducted from the point of view of economy and hygiene. The religious aspect of the question was not considered until I went to South Africa, where I undertook strenuous experiments which will be narrated later. The seed, however, for all of them was sown in England.

A convert's enthusiasm for his new religion is greater than that of a person who is born in it. Vegetarianism was then a new cult in England, and likewise for me, because as we have seen I had gone there a convinced meat-eater, and was intellectually converted to vegetarianism later. Full of the neophyte's zeal for vegetarianism, I decided to start a vegetarian club in my locality, Bayswater. I invited Sir Edwin Arnold, who lived there, to be vice-president. Dr. Oldfield, was was Editor of *The Vegetarian,* became president. I myself became the secretary. The club went on well for a while, but came to an end in the course of a few months. For I left the locality, according to my custom of moving from place to place periodically. But this brief and modest experience gave me some little training in organizing and conducting institutions.

M. K. GANDHI.

(*Translated from Navajivan by Mahadeo Desai*)

Gandhi the Christian!

"A greater Christian than many a Christian" is the tribute paid to Gandhiji by Dr. Josiah Oldfield, Senior Physician, Lady Margaret Trinitarian Hospital, Kent, who in a letter to the *Hindu* recalls the interesting reminiscences of Gandhiji's life in England, especially in connection with the work of the Vegetarian Society, of which Gandhiji was the Secretary, and the Doctor the President. In the course of the letter the Doctor says:

"Gandhi in his reminiscences recalls his comradeship with myself and the influence that I had upon him when he was a student in England and I should like to place on record for the encouragement of all young Indians coming to England that Gandhi placed his word on a higher plane than his life and that what he promised his mother he fulfilled wholly, regardless whether it meant living or dying.

"This lonely lad, in a foreign country, without friends or colleagues and with pressure of the doctors and nurses round him, determined that he would die if necessary rather than break his pledged word to his mother and his God. His work in England, even as a youth, although he belittles it in his autobiography, was always marked by earnestness, thoroughness, trustworthiness and perseverance.

"We had many discussions upon religion and I recognize today that Gandhi's life was far more in accord with the ideal life of a Christian, although he refused to become one in name, than that of millions who are Christians in name, but who do not pretend even to follow the rule of Christianity in their lives. I should like to recall that mark of Gandhi's endurance when he came to England in connection with the South African work. He was suffering severely from a carious tooth, which gave him painful sleeplessness. He had to attend a committee meeting for an hour and then another one was to follow. In the interval he asked me if I would remove the tooth during the few spare minutes. After examining it, and finding it was a difficult and painful one to take out, I gave him anesthetic, removed the tooth and then minutes later he was holding his next committee. Most people would have lain down for an hour after having had anesthetic.

"It was a matter of great sorrow to me when I saw last a photograph of the Mahatma after he had come out of the hospital following his imprisonment, and I compared it with a photograph which I reproduced when I was editing a newspaper in England of the same man when he was a fair young lad. There may be millions who disagree with much that Gandhi has taught, but there are still larger numbers who recognize his single-heartedness, his wisdom of outlook and deep probity of nature. These are characters which are far more valuable to the world than being called a clever politician or a wise member of the legislature."—Bombay *Chronicle.*

QUEST

We know that there are worlds upon vast worlds
Beyond the narrow range of our conceiving.
We know this spinning earth of ours to be
A trifling cosmic accident—no more—
From which a state developed that produced
Conditions for the things men know as Life,
Of which we mortals are the flowering.
Yet, we who realize the magnitude
Of vast unbounded spheres beyond our knowing
We build our lives on petty human whims,
We mould our thoughts on petty human fears,
Make our frail mind the final arbiter.
We think in words of kings and states and laws,
Of transitory things that come and go
Like autumn leaves and all moon-governed tides.
Oh, let us turn to great abiding things,
And seek to learn the strange eternal laws
That bind us all in cosmic unity,
Lifting our hearts beyond this universe
To find the Master of all Mystery!

LUCIA TRENT.

For UNITY.

Eternal Recurrence

Tho Christ is dead, Gethsemane
Remains; and more than tourists see
The earthen skull named Golgotha.
Annas and Pontius Pilate are
(Still gentlemen, still cultured—*very*),
Recurrently contemporary.
Centurions would feel at home
Today in Mussolini's Rome.
Caesar's immortal legions are
In action still at Amritsar.
A Cross of water has sufficed
For many a Filipino Christ.
Today in many a devil's-region,
Still, still they say: "My name is Legion!"
His temple-veil become a steeple,
Caiaphas cries that for the People
It is expedient still that one man
Who won't become his nation's gun-man
Should . . . well, not die . . . but quietly pass
Say twenty years in Alcatraz.
Ourselves, perhaps, may wake—and be
Not *bystanders* on Calvary!

E. MERRILL ROOT.

President Coolidge and Jefferson

Many readers of the addresses included in President Coolidge's volume on "The Cost of Freedom" remarked upon the slight notice of Jefferson in addresses dealing with events in which Jefferson was so conspicuous an actor. The neglect was almost ostentatious. The thirty addresses were almost all historical and memorial, and largely tributes to American statesmen, including an entire address on William McKinley. There is a special address on Hamilton, with much in it that is just and praiseworthy, and with praise of Hamilton's part in the framing of the Constitution that is groundless and ridiculous. Mr. Coolidge might have learned even from Henry Cabot Lodge that Hamilton's proposal for the Constitution was a President and Senate elected for life by owners of real estate, with the governors of the states appointed by the President. There is unstinted panegyric of Washington and Marshall; but the references to Jefferson, even in the Fredericksburg address on great Virginians, are casual and unimportant, while always respectful and correct. No omission in the volume is more glaring save the paucity of reference to the World War. Practically all of these thirty addresses belong to the period of the war, yet I think there are but three passages touching any aspect of war and those such as might have been omitted without detriment to the volume. There is nothing to indicate that the momentous tragedy, perhaps the greatest in human history, ploughed any furrow in Mr. Coolidge's brain. I do not know of any other equally conspicuous statesman of the period, especially an industrious orator, who so successfully achieved that feat.

President Coolidge's volume of addresses was published two years ago. On May 15 of the present year he gave an address at Williamsburg, Va., at the commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the famous Virginia resolutions in behalf of independence. The address, we read, was applauded especially when Mr. Coolidge declared that "no method of procedure has ever been devised in which liberty could be divorced from local self-government, no plan of centralization has ever been adopted which did not result in bureaucracy, tyranny, reaction and decline." The last half of the address was devoted to enforcing this truth. The first half was devoted to the illustrious history of Williamsburg and William and Mary College. William and Mary "furnished inspiration to Bland, to Wythe, to Nelson and to Jefferson." The Williamsburg resolutions of May, 1776, "were composed by no ordinary men. Such a document could only be produced by character and culture. The excellence of the official documents of the Revolutionary epoch have often been remarked; it was such as to draw praise from the foremost British statesmen. Into the making of the Williamsburg resolutions of May, 1776, went all that was best of some of William and Mary's distinguished sons."

The most powerful and most memorable document of the Revolution was the Declaration of Independence. The most distinguished son of William and Mary was Thomas Jefferson. At that time and place it would seem as if no one could fail to say that. The lesson which the President enforced was this: "The states are the sheet anchors of our institutions. If the federal government should go out of existence, the common run of people would not detect the difference in the affairs of their daily life for a considerable length of time. But if the authority of the states were struck down, disorder approaching chaos would be upon us in twenty-four hours. The national administration is not and can not be adjusted to the needs of local government. It is too far away to be informed of local needs, too inaccessible to be responsive to local condition. . . . The federal government ought to resist the tendency to be loaded up with duties which the states should perform. It does not follow that because something ought to be done the national government ought to do it. . . . I want to see the policy adopted by the states of discharging their public functions so faithfully that instead of an extension on the part of the federal government there can be contraction."

One orator in a hundred only would have failed at this point to exclaim, at that time and place:

> As we pledge ourselves anew to this great principle, let it gain added emphasis in the remembrance that it was the distinctive principle of Thomas Jefferson and found its most persistent and powerful expression from that most illustrious son of William and Mary.

Mr. Coolidge was the hundredth man.

The volume of Mr. Coolidge's historical addresses does not include any address specially concerned with the Declaration of Independence. That subject was his theme at Philadelphia on July 5; and its silence on Jefferson, the great author of the Declaration, was so remarkable as to be almost incredible. No other Fourth of July oration in the country surely omitted mention of Jefferson with such skill. It was not only the 150th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence; but by one of the most impressive coincidences in history the centennial of the death of Jefferson. Yet the President's address contains no tribute to Jefferson, whose name even is mentioned in but two passing references, both of them emphasizing Jefferson's obligation to others, and one of them quite misleading. Referring to the declaration of Rights presented by the Virginia Assembly by George Mason in May, 1776, Mr. Coolidge says: "It can scarcely be imagined that Jefferson was unacquainted with what had been done in his own Commonwealth of Virginia."

Unacquainted! Does not Mr. Coolidge know that Jefferson's "Summary View of the Rights of British America" was presented to the convention at Williamsburg in August, 1774; that it was taken up in London by Burke and other friends of our cause, printed there in pamphlet form, and ran rapidly through several editions; that it was the inspiration of Mason, Wythe and the other Virginia democrats, whose leader, not follower, Jefferson was; and that it was this bold declaration by Jefferson, a little too radical even for Virginia in 1774, which made Congress and the country turn to him as the natural writer of the Declaration of Independence in 1776, when resolute men had become sick of men who talked with cotton—and—wool in their mouths?

As it was with the Declaration of Independence in 1776, so it was with the reform of the laws of Virginia the next year, which Jefferson left Congress to push through, because he felt that he "could be of more use in forwarding that work." "The results of his labor," says Mr. Morse, no thick-and-thin Jeffersonian, in his biography, "changed not only the surface but the fundamental strata of the social and economical system of

Virginia. George Mason, George Wythe and Madison were Jefferson's coadjutors. But they were coadjutors and lieutenants only; Jefferson was the principal and the leader."

President Coolidge seeks throughout to minimize the originality and advanced character of the Declaration and to present it as but the natural and necessary evolution and expression of sentiments of freedom and independence inherent in the colonies for a century. There is a certain general truth in this; and the struggle of the colonies against King George was in a very real way a repetition of the Puritan struggle against King Charles. But that is all that can be said. President Butler of Columbia University put the truth exactly in his Fourth of July address to the American meeting in London, when he said that an English squire in such a revolution would have talked of English rights, but that Jefferson appealed to the public opinion of mankind. This is brought out impressively in his recent work on the American Revolution by Professor McElwain of Harvard, who shows that precisely what our leaders up to July, 1776, did was to talk about Englishmen in the colonies having the same rights as Englishmen in England, and that Jefferson in the Declaration first lifted the argument to universality. It was Abraham Lincoln, who pronounced Jefferson the greatest political thinker we ever had or were likely to have, who most memorably emphasized this true view. "All honor to Jefferson," he said, "the man who, in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people, had the coolness, foresight and capacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document an abstract truth applicable to all men and all times, that today and in all coming days it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling-block to the very harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression."

The most noteworthy and the most noble utterance of this great anniversary time is the paper of Lauristan Bullard on the Declaration of Independence, published in the Boston Herald of July 3. If the gist of this timely paper could have been injected into the middle of President Coolidge's address, it would have made that address what it ought to be. It puts personality into the Philadelphia events of those old July days, and shows us a Congress of human beings, afire with profound feeling and high resolve. "Originality? Jefferson was familiar with John Locke." He must state the ideas that are familiar to all the people, because the Declaration must be adopted by all the people. Jefferson himself said long afterwards:

> I did not consider it any of my charge to invent new ideas and to offer no sentiment which had been emphasized before . . . whether I had gathered my ideas from reading or reflection, I do not know, I know only that I turned neither to book nor pamphlet while writing it.

The Declaration of Independence is as original as Magna Charta. If Lincoln at Gettysburg was original —'government of the people, by the people, for the people'—then Thomas Jefferson was original at Philadelphia in 1776—He poured the soul of a continent into the proclamation he composed."

President Coolidge, least of all men, has reason to dread the name of Jefferson, if dread it he does; for whether he knows it or not, he is himself in high degree a Jeffersonian. His Vermont farm genesis, his Connecticut Valley schooling, and his long Springfield Republican enlightenment cut him out for a Jeffersonian; but he somehow strayed, and is now more or less blindly, as it seems to some, but with honest heart, striving to get on to the track. Every fundamental principle which his Washington experience has brought him to proclaim—the danger of centralization of national bureaucracy, the necessity of the state attending to the duties which they can best perform, the folly of over-reliance on legislation as the agency of progress, the imperativeness of a prosperous agriculture and of popular education, the menace of militarism and great armaments to the world and especially to democracy,—these are the very principles, and the distinctive principles, of Thomas Jefferson.

President Coolidge does recognize that the Declaration, "the most important civil document in the world," is a "great spiritual document," that its first paragraph opens with a reference to "nature's God," and that it closes with "an appeal to the Supreme Judge of the World." This tribute to the religious element in Jefferson by a New England Congregationalist on this centennial gives added emphasis to the lesson which now at last is being learned, that Jefferson was the most religious man who was ever President of the United States, that he did vastly more religious study and thinking than any other, more especially to emphasize the preeminence of the New Testament, and that when he gave his last half hour each night to reading the words of Christ, it meant something. The old New England orthodoxy so hated his Unitarianism, and in the frenzied election of 1800 screamed so loudly about his "French infidelity," that multitudes today think there was something in it. There was nothing in it. Religion and democracy, like education and democracy, with Jefferson were one.

The really noteworthy and valuable part of President Coolidge's address is that which emphasizes the power of the pulpit in the Revolution and the imperativeness of religion in our politics. His high tribute to John Wise especially should prompt a new edition of John Wise's profound and stirring old treatise on Government. John Wise's democracy landed him in jail under the Andros tyranny. The accents of this great pulpit precursor of Jefferson are heard in James Otis, in Samuel Adams, and in the Continental Congress of 1774.

One of our Massachusetts Congressmen who dislikes the Church because the Church believes in prohibition and the League of Nations which he does not believe in has been shouting that the Church should keep out of politics. He likes politics and says he likes religion, but he likes them separate; just as those steel magnates at Pittsburgh, whom Bishop McConnell and the Pittsburgh churches found themselves up against when they were campaigning for decent hours and decent treatment for the workmen in the forges, wanted business and religion kept separate. Not so Calvin Coolidge; and not so our Puritan and Revolutionary fathers. They were brought up on the Hebrew prophets; and they knew that it would not have done to tell Prophet Isaiah or Prophet Amos to leave politics to Uzziah, Ahaz and Hezekiah. Almost the whole of Jewish prophecy is politics. We have made their politics our religion. It is time that we made our own that; and President Coolidge is to be thanked for saying this with power. New England especially should never forget that the real founder of the Scrooby company and of Plymouth was Elder Brewster; that the founder of Rhode Island was Roger Williams; and the founder of Connecticut was Thomas Hooker. It was

under the mighty preaching of Thomas Hooker at Hartford, wrote John Fiske, that American democracy was born. Jonathan Mayhew, in the pulpit of the old West Church in Boston, was almost as potent a factor for the Revolution as Samuel Adams; and the idea of "committees of correspondence" in Massachusetts was his idea.

Two-thirds of the men of the Revolution were Calvinists. Bergeaud, the great Geneva scholar of today, in his illuminating book on "The Rise of Modern Democracy in Old and New England," emphasizes the parallelism of Puritan religion and Puritan politics and the priority of the religious influence. John Calvin had no more patience than Jesus Christ with a "kingdom come" in heaven and not on earth. His business was to organize the town of Geneva, for which he was immediately responsible, in accordance with the law of God; and that was the business alike of the pulpit and the pew in Puritan London and Puritan Boston. It was the business of the churches in the American Revolution; and the President well admonishes our churches, on this conspicuous anniversary, to cherish and follow their great example.

EDWIN D. MEAD.

The Study Table

The Next War*

The author of this book* is a realist. He knows that the Great War was a "sham," that its claims to high ideals of civilization and democracy were all dishonest, that the "defense of Belgium" was a mere propaganda pretext for getting England righteously into the conflict in pursuit of her own unrighteous and utterly selfish imperialistic interests, that "the War was fought for the sake of economic prizes" (p. 46), that "civilized nations" are simply "industrial nations with large armies or navies or with both" (p. 34).

With such vision, Mr. Bakeless looks at the world today, and sees it strangely, terribly like the world before 1914. "Forces essentially identical with those that caused the last World War," he says (p. 5), "are actively at work today, preparing the way for a new one." These forces are fundamentally economic in character—"the growth of population, the need of colonies, markets, food, and raw materials" (p. 230). They are all now busy in various areas of the globe, which the author carefully isolates and describes in a series of vivid and fact-laden chapters under the general heading, "Tensions of the Modern World." A chapter on "The Weapons of the Next War" is as horrific and authoritative as anything given us by Will Irwin in his various writings. Notes and maps complete the picture.

This book is recommended to the men and women now afflicted with that disease of optimism which betrayed so many of us a decade and a half ago. If it is weak on any side, it is on that which has to do with the new agencies of peace which have come into the world since 1919. But Mr. Bakeless cannot be blamed for ignoring these. He knows and mentions them, but simply refuses to take them seriously.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

"Black Laughter"**

I have already reviewed one of Llewelyn Powys' books, "Ebony and Ivory," but this latter volume of African sketches seems to me more admirable than the earlier one, and I want to call the attention of readers to it. Moreover, the Powys family are so distinguished that one wants to keep in touch with them. The September number of the Century has an article by John Cowper Powys called "Four Brothers," in which he describes the four men of his family who have recently made their way into print. They are of Welsh and Norfolk stock, reared in Dorset and "displaying to the end of our days," John Powys writes, "a certain simple, rustic, naive, pastoral quality which mingles quaintly enough with our various sophisticated perversities." Llewelyn Powys, the youngest, is described by his brother as "a poetical materialist with an unconquerable zest for life—for life on any terms", and again as "an incorrigible adventurer, the life-intoxicated world child." We who read "Black Laughter" find him all this, and in simpler terms call him a vivid story teller who gives us a glimpse of an Africa that no one else has yet shown.

Llewellyn Powys, in search of health, went to join one of his brothers (not one of the writers) in East Africa. He landed at a little wayside station, where, his brother failing to meet him, he had to spend the night in a woodshed by the side of the track. He was awakened by the roar of a lion who came so near him that he *could hear its breathing.* He slept no more that night, and learned in the morning from the station master, that it was a polite "lion" who disturbed no one but had come down to the water tank to drink! So his adventures began. There are a long line of them told with the touch of the poet. There is the lovely portrait of the Masai maiden whom he was tempted to buy from her father and take to wife. But the fear in the girl's eyes held him back. There is Merishu, the only Masai whom he found interested in European civilization, whom he taught to write, and who, dying, strove to trace the message on the sands. The tropics are apt to breed cruelty in the white man, but our author feels sympathy and understanding for the life about him. He is an Englishman who looks with respect upon the Mahommedan Negro who turns his face to the rising and setting sun and prays, though it deprive the master of an hour's daily work. He is an Englishman who feels the majesty of the animal life about him. He despises Paul Raney (whose moving pictures once delighted us) who could look upon a herd of zebra, with "sleek striped flanks and inquisitive mottled heads," and say "I would like to send a bullet into that little outfit." Who when his hounds got upon the scent of a lion cried out, "I see you, I see you, you son of a bitch." Not so Powys toward the king of all beasts. He sees the splendor of this great animal world in which man plays so small a part. He is no callous, unimaginative hunter of big game.

"O Africa! Africa! how eagerly, how savagely,

*"The Origin of the Next War," by John Bakeless, published by the Viking Press, New York.

**By Llewelyn Powys. Published by Messrs. Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York City.

you avenge even so much as the cutting of a branch or the artificial manipulation of a single one of your stones! And yet the hour is fast approaching, when even your stiff mouth will wince under a hideous double bit; when your stiff neck will be bowed in ignoble subjection."

I presume that that day which Powys predicts will soon come. Already those who visit in comfort equatorial Africa know little of the roar of the lion or the laugh of the hyena. They tell us of natives, discreetly clad, singing our atrocious hymns. It will be in such books as "Black Laughter" that the picture of the dark continent, untamed, will remain for the future. And reading it, people will understand what life was to the men who lived among such things. As Powys says regarding a battle he once listened to between two lions: "Now that I am once more living among civilized surroundings I come to appreciate how liberating to my spirit the mere contemplation of such African incidents has been. When I am in danger of being encaged in this or that cleverly baited bourgeous trap I have but to think of that sublime battle, and petty considerations, petty preoccupations fall into place."

MARY WHITE OVINGTON.

Note

Mr. Holmes's last book, "Patriotism Is Not Enough," has appeared in Australia. The *Australian Worker* calls attention to it as "a timely book which should find its way into every person's sanctum." It "says things which some of us have been saying for years, but says them better."

Correspondence

The Way to Outlawry

Editor of UNITY:

America probably leads the world in talking about the outlawing of war, but the Scandinavian countries and Holland and Switzerland lead the world in actually doing it. The foremost advocates of outlawry seem slow to recognize the very thing for which they plead, when it takes place before their eyes. UNITY is an exception in that it sees in the recent all-inclusive peace treaties several countries in Europe have made with each other real "victories for Outlawry." (See UNITY, May 24.)

Some weeks ago an Associated Press dispatch from Stockholm was as follows: "As a safeguard against war for any cause whatever, Sweden has now signed a general arbitration treaty with Belgium, the seventh of a series with its European neighbors. The others were with Germany, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Denmark, Norway and Finland." This dispatch was headed "Outlawing War." The editor who gave the item that caption was quite right. It is by such treaties that war is being outlawed. When all the nations are mutually bound in a network of them, then the outlawing of war will be complete. But the more enlightened countries need not wait for their backward sisters. Every such agreement diminishes by so much the area within which war is a legal procedure. There is therefore no need to wait a single day for the codification of international law or anything else before our country can participate in the outlawing process that is now going on.

At the Chicago conference of peacemakers (June 10th and 11th) the very first of the resolutions adopted, the "keynote," called for the outlawing of war. The fourth resolution pointed to "the rapid extension of arbitration and allied forms of peaceful settlement among European countries . . . by which more than one nation has agreed to submit every possible case of international dispute to its appropriate tribunal, not even reserving questions of national honor and vital interest," and urged "the government of the United States to participate in this movement." Now an agreement on the part of two nations that they will settle peaceably every dispute between themselves is nothing less than the outlawing of war as far as their interrelations are concerned. War between those two nations, on whatever plea, is illegal. The fourth resolution therefore properly belongs with the first. The two things, viz., the outlawing of war and the making of all-inclusive peace treaties, should be tied together in our minds, for they are essentially one and the same. Did none of the peacemakers in the Chicago conference perceive this?

To be sure, in none of these comprehensive peace treaties is war explicitly branded as a "crime." The treaties simply provide specifically how various classes of disputes shall be settled peaceably, and they say nothing about war, but assume the good faith of the contracting parties. This is exactly what was done when our federal system was framed. Our Constitution provides for the pacific settlement of disputes between the states and takes it for granted that the prescribed method will be followed, ignoring the possibility that a state make war upon its neighbor state. "Crime" is a word strictly applicable only to the act of an individual. A nation as such can not commit a crime.

No two countries of the first rank have yet made an all-inclusive peace pact with each other. President Taft advocated such a treaty with Britain in 1910, but the Senate was unwilling to impair our precious sovereign right to go to war when he felt like it! In urging the government of the United States to "participate in the movement" for peace treaties begun by some of the smaller European countries, the peacemakers at Chicago seem to me to have indicated, albeit unwittingly, the specific endeavor in which the "unifying purpose and dominating motive of all peace groups"—viz., to outlaw war—may find immediate practical expression. *Let us ask President Coolidge to take the initiative in outlawing war between the two English-speaking peoples by a treaty pledging the peaceable settlement of all disputes between them, not excepting questions of national honor and vital interest.*

HENRY W. PINKHAM.

Brookline, Mass.

Peacemakers and Hoodlums at Concord

Editor of UNITY:

The suppression of the Young People's Peace Conference at Concord by an unholy alliance of ex-soldiers, ex-gentlemen and ex-Christians is the most flagrant crime against free speech that Massachusetts has witnessed for a generation. A great public meeting to protest against these multiplying violations of the right of free speech was held in the Old South Meeting House a fortnight ago. It did not come too soon; and a louder meeting is now in order. Unitarians may take a certain satisfaction, if it is a satisfaction, that most of the speakers at this Old South Free Speech meeting were of this fellowship. The consolation is needed; for the Unitarian exhibition at Concord was certainly not edifying. We may be grateful that when the proffered use of the vestry of the Unitarian church, Emerson's church at that, was withdrawn from the young people, the Episcopal church at Concord promptly opened its doors for them, as could hardly fail in the diocese of Phillips Brooks and William Lawrence. But the mob of hoodlums, stirred up by the violent and ridiculous manifesto of the Concord Legion, that followed them into the church, kept up its intermittent fusillade of stones and rotten eggs throughout the week, until the Young People's clothes were so damaged and their nerves so worn out, that the experience became unendurable and, unwilling also to expose more of their lecturers to indignities, they called off the second week of their conference and went home.

In justice to the good people of Concord, it should be remembered that this insane outburst did not originate with them, but with Legion men from Boston, who, when they learned of the proposed peace conference, went up to stir their fellows in Concord to opposition. Despite the opposition, the young people won increasing confidence and support from the citizens of Concord, who attended the meetings in ever larger numbers as the week wore on. At the meeting at which Mr. Speight, the minister of King's Chapel, gave his eloquent centennial address on Adams and

The Field

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion."

ORIENTAL STUDENTS' CONFERENCE

The forthcoming Oriental Students' Conference (Sept. 8-14), is going to be conducted in a new manner. At most of the young people's conferences, so-called, it is not the youth that does the thinking. The elders—the "leaders" so-called—do most of the thinking and the talking, the youth tamely listening. We are hoping that the Oriental Students' Conference will set a new fashion in Youth Conferences.

At this conference it is expected that youth will do most of the thinking and talking and the elders will "listen in." At the Oriental Students' Conference all points of view will be given a fair chance. The more experienced members of the group will be called upon from time to time to present their point of view and the point of view of the generation whose legacy youth has to inherit.

There is no set program. The tentative program drawn up by the Executive Committee is merely suggestive. The method of co-operative thinking will be followed, the program being made up from day to day. There will be no "leaders" to tell the young people what fitting conclusions must be arrived at as expressing the sentiment of youth! The Oriental Students' Conference will attempt to translate into reality the technique of co-operative thinking now being popularized by the Inquiry group.

Ours is a pioneering effort. Nothing like it has ever been attempted. At conferences arranged by religious organizations and associations the Oriental students have almost always had to go through considerable discomfort by being patronized. The Orientals no longer want to be patronized nor do they want to patronize.

This conference has no *official* connection with any organization, religious or otherwise. We take this opportunity, however, to express our hearty thanks to the members of the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church for their co-operation with us, and for placing at our disposal Taylor Hall, their National Center for Devotion and Conference, and to prominent churchmen and churchwomen of the Episcopal Church for their financial assistance in our novel enterprise. As we are not part of any existing organization we have to depend upon the generosity and good will of our liberal American friends of the Orient.

All friends of the Orient and believers in a better understanding between the Orient and the Occident may get further information by writing to Mr. S. C. Cheng, vice-chairman, Oriental Students' Conference, Taylor Hall, Racine, Wisconsin.

(Signed)

HARIDAS T. MAZUMDAR,
Chairman;
S. C. CHENG,
Vice-Chairman.

Program

September 8-14, 1926, Taylor Hall, Racine, Wisconsin

Outline of Topics for Discussion

I. International Fellowship.

1. **Various phases of International Politics.**
   - a. The Problem of Self-Determination.
   - b. Racialism, Pan-Asiatic Movement.
   - c. The League of Nations, The World Court, the Outlawry of War.
   - d. Nationalism versus Internationalism.
     1. A discussion of the two points of view.
2. **The Economic Aspects of International Relations.**
   - a. Overpopulation.
   - b. Foreign Investments and Exploitation.
   - c. The Opium Question.
   - d. Extra-Territoriality.
   - e. Immigration.
     1. Chinese Exclusion Act.
     2. Japanese Exclusion Act.
     3. The Supreme Court's Decision Denying Citizenship to Hindus.
3. **How Can We Achieve Real International Friendship?**
   - a. Through Universal Language and Literature, or Through International Ethics?
   - b. What Would Be Involved in the Codification of International Laws?
   - c. A Study of the Means that are Used to Advance International Friendship.

II. Social Conditions and Race Relations

- a. The Youth and Women Movements in the Orient, and their possible effects on International Relations.
- b. The Problem of the Missionary in the Orient (From a Social Standpoint).
- c. The Missionary as a Problem in the Orient (From a Social Standpoint).
- d. Considering the social heritages and traditions of the different peoples of the world, how can we bring about better race relations?
- e. The "Superiority Complex" of the Occident as against the Orient and vice versa.
- f. As students from the Orient, what can we contribute towards real International Understanding? What can we give our American fellow-stu-

---

Jefferson, more than 300 were present: but even this meeting was rotten-egged.

The performances of the veterans were almost incredible in their wantonness and folly. In the manifesto which they published in the Boston papers, they warned their fellow-citizens against the young peace advocates coming to Concord with sinister motives, plotting to "undermine and overthrow the Constitution." Their campaign culminated in a mass meeting in the Town Hall. A respected citizen of Concord was found willing to preside: but it is refreshing to read that the speakers were imported. One devoted his speech to communism, though what this had to do with the young men and women of the peace conference it is hard to divine. Another hazarded the opinion that their organization was somehow related to a movement started in Bavaria 150 years ago for the overthrow of government and religion. Never surely was such a vacation of brains witnessed in the revered town of Concord.

The stuff retailed by the Concord veterans was the cold-roast of what was dealt out in Boston on Armistice Day last autumn, and was then so roundly denounced by the Boston press and so robustly disregarded by Governor Fuller. It is absolutely groundless. Performances like this and that at the peace meeting on Boston Common, seeking to buldoze those with whom they are incompetent to argue, are what fill so many people with distrust of the peace professions of so many military men. There is no mob so hateful as a military mob, prating of patriotism and devotion to law and order. If the intelligent and sober leaders can not check these ebullitions, irreparable damage will be done their body in the eyes of patriotic citizens. The plain people of Massachusetts and of the country are sick of this sort of thing; and the military gentlemen should be taught energetically that there is no valor in breaking up peace meetings and that they are subject to the same rules of decency as other folks.

A few of these young peace people—if there were many, it would hurt nobody—may be Quakers; some are almost Quakers. The main body is made up of all sorts and conditions, like the rest of us. I wish that half of their critics were half so serious in their patriotism and their reverence for the founders of the republic. Some would die before they would kill a fellowman, even in defensive war, and some have paid a price for their doctrine. They think Christ was with them in their "non-resistance"; and a good argument can be made for that view. The utterances of some of them are more "radical" than I personally use or sanction. I am glad they are. They are young; and boldness with youth is better than doubt and fear. They will become "correct" quite fast enough. The peace movement must soon pass into the hands of the rising generation. If it is to triumph in their hands, it must be because they recoil from the whole war system, its waste and futility and sin, as Garrison and Phillips and Emerson recoiled from slavery, as George F. Hoar, who lies beside Emerson in Sleepy Hollow, recoiled from imperialism. I, for one, do not think the republic has half so much to fear from the rashness of some young men as from the dry rot of some older men and the "chivalry" of veterans out of business.

EDWIN D. MEAD.

Boston, Mass.

THE STUDENTS' CAMP

Oliverea, via Big Indian Ulster County, N. Y.

For those seeking to spend their vacation amidst the beauty of nature and in a cultural atmosphere.

Situated in a secluded mountain hollow in the Catskills, 2,000 feet elevation.

The camp is equipped with bungalows, tents, tennis court, fresh-water swimming pool and a house with modern conveniences.

Activities: Sports, hikes, bathing, camp-fire lectures, readings and discussions. Association with congenial and intelligent people.

Rates: $7 per week for accommodations without meals, bringing own blankets. $20 per week for lodging and vegetarian meals. Send reservations to Walter Siegmeister.

dents? What can they give us?

III. Religious Attitudes and Experiences.
1. The Oriental Point of View.
   a. Hinduism, Buddhism, Shintoism, Confucianism, Zoroastrianism, Mohammedanism, Christianity.
   b. The attitude of the Occidental Christian missionaries in the Orient towards other religions.
   c. The dilemma of the Orient—Christian mission work on the one hand, and political conflicts on the other!
   d. The Orient's estimation of the Religion of Christ, of "Christianity," and of the mission work.
2. The Occidental Point of View.
   a. Christianity, the scientific attitude, industrial efficiency, social service ideals, etc.
   b. Ideals back of the Missionary Movement.
3. Is the Coming Religion Going to be a Synthesis, a Displacement, or an Absorption?

IV. Conclusion.
   a. What can we contribute to the Student life of America during our stay here?
   b. What can we take home from America?

"The Seven Deadly Sins of Militarism"

An Address by
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Single copies, 10 cents; twelve copies, $1; postpaid

Other Addresses by Mr. Holmes:
"Is Roman Catholicism a Menace to America?"
"Today's Challenge to the Jew: Advance or Retreat."
"Thomas Paine: Political and Religious Revolutionist."
"The Problem of the Unmarried"
"Great Possessions: What Are They?"
"Neglected Pleasures."
10 cents a copy, postpaid

Address: Secretary,
The Community Church
12 Park Avenue, New York City

WANTED

Private individual interested in Whitman and Traubel desires to obtain copies of the CONSERVATOR. Address: "Conservator," care of UNITY, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove
Tel. Atlantic 1876

JULY

With its tennis and golf, its motoring and yachting days in the great out doors, makes unusually important the condition of your sports and outing apparel. Quick service so often a necessity finds expression here in our dispatch cleansing by the most approved of scientific methods.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 9231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Your health, and the health of your entire family will be benefited by a daily glass of

Bowman
DAIRY COMPANY
Milk!

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.